

Q1 Cont a reading step of reading an address of a designated site stored in said memory and control information for respective image input means of the designated site; and an access and control step of accessing said designated site by using the address read by said reading step and controlling said designated site using control information read by said reading step, wherein said control information includes an identifier for identifying an item to be controlled by said image input means.

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-34 and 41-52 are currently pending. Claims 19-23 are withdrawn from consideration.

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-34 and 41-52 would be pending.

To assist the Examiner, attached to this Amendment is an "Attachment" that shows the amendments made to the claim 1 by bracketing the text that has been deleted and underlining the text that has been added.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 1, 3-10, 49, and 11, 13-20, 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sergeant et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,236). Claims 2, 12, 47-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sergeant and further in view of WebCam⁺ and RFC 1866 "Hypertext Markup Language – 2.0" and RFC 1738 "Uniform

Resource Locators (URL).” Claims 23-34, 41-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackshear (U.S. Patent No. 5,111,288) and further in view of WebCam⁺, and Niwa (U.S. Patent No. 5,544,046). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims, for the reasons set forth below.

A. CLAIMS 1 AND 11:

Claim 1, as amended, and claim 11 are directed to an arrangement in which both a network address of a site and control information for respective image input means of a site are stored. Subsequently, the site may be accessed and controlled by reading and using the stored address and associated control information. In other words, the control information is not stored locally at the site.

On the contrary, Sergeant is directed to a surveillance system including a plurality of remote surveillance units 12 (e.g., 12a, 12b and 12c) coupled to a CPU 28, across a switcher/multiplexer 24.. Each surveillance unit 12 (Fig. 2) includes a video camera having a domed microcontroller 46 which controls the operations of the camera. In operation, a PRESET command may be implemented to have angular coordinates of the camera stored within internal registers of the dome microcontroller 46. See Sergeant, col. 7, lines 52-57. When a RECALL command is received by the surveillance unit 12, the microcontroller 46 positions the camera in accordance with the locally stored and retrieved coordinates. See Sergeant, col. 7, lines 57 et seq. A plurality of coordinates may be stored locally for each surveillance unit 12. See Sergeant, col. 8, lines 1-18. As such, Sergeant provides a system in which control information is maintained locally at each surveillance unit for subsequent implementation.

Accordingly, Sergeant does not disclose or suggest the claimed combination of storing network address and control information for a site, reading the address and associated control information, and accessing and controlling the site according to the stored and read address and associated control information. Thus, claims 1 and 11 and their dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

B. CLAIMS 23, 30 AND 31:

Independent claims 23 and 31 are directed to an arrangement involving transferring image information with information indicative of a service allowable range of the camera based on a received request.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Blackshear and WebCam+ do not disclose or suggest any information indicative of a service allowable range of a camera. The Examiner relies upon Niwa to address this deficiencies. However, Niwa is directed to a numerical controller unit for controlling a machining process, which is simply different from the camera control arrangement of the claimed inventions. In Niwa, an operator may provide memo data to define tolerance limits (e.g., an upper and lower limit) for particular data which is employed by a machining program to perform a machining process. The tolerance limits are simply not information indicative of a service allowable range of a camera. Thus, the cited references, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest any information indicative of a service allowable range of a camera.

The cited references are also silent as to the transfer of image information with information indicative of a service allowable range of a camera based on a received request. The

Examiner does not address in the Office Action how the references teach the transfer of both information upon a request.

Furthermore, Blackshear, as relied upon by the Examiner, shows an operator defining a window, e.g., a preshot, to be implemented when the camera is operated in the automatic mode. See Blackshear, col. 6, lines 6-22 and col. 9, lines 12-20. During this process of defining a window, the operator enters pan and tilt positions and these entered positions are displayed on the video monitor. WebCam+ is relied upon by the Examiner to show remote control of a camera over a network, i.e., the internet. Niwa, as discussed above, provides tolerance limits for data entry associated with machining operations and is unrelated to camera control. Accordingly, the references, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the transfer of image information with information indicative of a service allowable range of a camera based on a received request.

In view of the foregoing, claims 23 and 31 are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

C. CLAIMS 32, 33 AND 34:

Claims 32, 33 and 34 are directed to an arrangement involving comparing information indicative of the operable limitation of the camera transferred from the server with the request information and notifying the result of the comparison. The comparison is not performed by the server, but rather at a remote location.

For similar reasons as discussed above for claims 23 and 31, the cited references do not disclose or suggest any information indicative of the operable limitation of a camera or the transfer thereof.

D. CLAIM 21

Claim 21 is directed to a browser in which control information for image input means of an object site is stored, together with a network address of said site, in a memory.

As this claim has not been addressed with any particularity in the Office Action, Applicants presumes that claim 21 is allowable over the cited references.

page 7

E. DEPENDENT CLAIMS:

Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims provides additional features that further distinguish over the cited references, individually or in combination. For example, dependent claims 47, 48, 50 and 51 each recite one of the following: (1) the identifier is expressed as part of a path name in the URL, or (2) the identifier is expressed as part of a resource name in the path name in the URL.

The Examiner appears to assert that these limitations are taught by the references RFC 1866 and RFC 1798. However, RFC 1866, as relied upon by the Examiner, simply discusses a GET method in which a form data set is appended to the action URL. See RFC 1866, pages 46-47. The appended data set is not part of the path name of the URL or the resource name. In other words, the path or resource name or parts thereof are not employed as the claimed identifier for identifying the item to be controlled. As to RFC 1798, the Examiner points to a general discussion of HTTP syntax and GOPHER URL syntax which do not disclose

or suggest the identifier being expressed as part of a path name or resource name in the URL.

See RFC 1798, pages 9-10. Likewise, the path or resource name or parts thereof are not employed as the claimed identifier for identifying the item to be controlled.

For these reasons along with those set forth above for claims 1 and 11, these dependent claims are further patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4367US1. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4367US1. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN



By:

James Hwa
Registration No. 42,680
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Dated: April 4, 2003

Mailing Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154
(212) 758-4800
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s): Ohi et al.

Group Art Unit: 2153

Serial No.: 08/904,860

Examiner: D. Dinh

Filed: August 1, 1997

For: COMMUNICATION METHOD AND APPARATUS, SERVER AND CLIENT ON
NETWORK, AND PROGRAM CODES REALIZING COMMUNICATION
THEREOF

ATTACHMENT

Amendments made to the claim 1 herein are indicated in this attachment by
bracketing the text that has been deleted and underlining the text that has been added.

RECEIVED**APR 09 2003****Technology Center 2100****IN THE CLAIMS:**

Please note the following changes to claim 1:

1. (Twice Amended) A communication method comprising:
 - an address-storing step of storing a network address of an object site into a memory;
 - an information-storing step of storing control information for a respective image input means of said object site in relation to said network address;
 - a reading step of reading an address of a designated site stored in said memory and control information for respective image input means of the designated site; and
 - an access and control step of accessing said designated site by using the address read by said reading step and controlling said designated site using control information read by said reading step, wherein said control information includes an identifier for identifying an item to be controlled by said image input means.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4367US1. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4367US1. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN



By:

James Hwa
Registration No. 42,680
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Dated: April 4, 2003

Mailing Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154
(212) 758-4800
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile